

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
CHARLESTON DIVISION

Matthew Thomas Pickens,
Petitioner,

vs.

South Carolina Department of Probation,
Parole, and Pardon Services,
Respondents

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

C.A. No.: 2:09-2127-RBH

ORDER

This matter is before the court for review of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Robert S. Carr, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with this court. See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made, and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

No objections have been filed to the Report and Recommendation. In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

After a thorough review of the Report and Recommendation and the record in this case, the court adopts Magistrate Judge Carr's Report and Recommendation and incorporates it herein.

It is therefore

ORDERED that the Section 2241 petition in the above-captioned case is dismissed without prejudice and without service of process for failure to exhaust administrative remedies.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ R. Bryan Harwell
R. Bryan Harwell
United States District Judge

Florence, South Carolina
October 28, 2009